

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed August 28, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 17 have been amended.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 5,519,704 to Farinacci et al. (hereinafter, "Farinacci") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,036,518 to Tseung (hereinafter, "Tseung"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The M.P.E.P. states that

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.

M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims at issue are patentably distinct from the cited references. The cited references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations in these claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in pertinent part, “wherein said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Support for this limitation may be found in Applicants’ specification, page 14, lines 9-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Instead, Farinacci teaches “[n]ode C 301c has no feasible successor for its route to node N 301n, so it sends a query packet 403 as its response to node B 301b.” Farinacci, col. 5, lines 53-55.

The Office Action asserts that the above-identified sentence of Farinacci teaches “receiving a request to complete said task from at least one device.” See, Office Action, page 2. However, a “query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose a request including “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device” as claimed by Applicants.

Farinacci further states:

Query packets 403 may be multicast, in response to losing a feasible successor to a destination, or may be unicast, in response to a query packet 403 where the router 105 receiving a query packet 403 also does not have a feasible successor. In this case, however, the neighbor router 105 initiates its own multicast query packet 403 and must eventually respond to the originator of the first query packet 403 with a reply packet 404. Query packets 403 may also be unicast when a multicast query packet 403 is not acknowledged by one or more specific neighbor routers 105, as disclosed herein.

Farinacci, col. 7, lines 12-22.

“Query packets 403 [that] may be multicast . . . or . . . unicast” does not teach, suggest or disclose “query packets” that include “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” In addition, “the neighbor router 105 initiat[ing] its own multicast query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.”

Applicants wish to emphasize that the claimed request does not merely claim an identifier. Instead, the claimed request claims “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” For example, Farinacci discloses that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number . . . and an acknowledgment field.” Farinacci, col. 7, line 29-31. However, a “sequence number” and an “acknowledgment field” do not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Instead, Farinacci teaches that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet.” Farinacci, col. 7, lines 29-32. “[A] sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask” as claimed by Applicants.

As set forth above, Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 1. As such, the combination of Farinacci, in view of Tseung, also does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3 depend directly from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-3 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 4 has also been amended to recite, in pertinent part, “wherein said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Support for this limitation may be found in Applicants’ specification, page 14, lines 9-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Instead, Farinacci teaches “[n]ode C 301c has no feasible successor for its route to

node N 301n, so it sends a query packet 403 as its response to node B 301b.” Farinacci, col. 5, lines 53-55.

The Office Action asserts that the above-identified sentence of Farinacci teaches “receiving a request to complete said task from at least one device.” See, Office Action, page 2. However, a “query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose a request including “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device” as claimed by Applicants.

Farinacci further states:

Query packets 403 may be multicast, in response to losing a feasible successor to a destination, or may be unicast, in response to a query packet 403 where the router 105 receiving a query packet 403 also does not have a feasible successor. In this case, however, the neighbor router 105 initiates its own multicast query packet 403 and must eventually respond to the originator of the first query packet 403 with a reply packet 404. Query packets 403 may also be unicast when a multicast query packet 403 is not acknowledged by one or more specific neighbor routers 105, as disclosed herein.

Farinacci, col. 7, lines 12-22.

“Query packets 403 [that] may be multicast . . . or . . . unicast” does not teach, suggest or disclose “query packets” that include “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” In addition, “the neighbor router 105 initiat[ing] its own multicast query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.”

Applicants wish to emphasize that the claimed request does not merely claim an identifier. Instead, the claimed request claims “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” For example, Farinacci discloses that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number . . . and an acknowledgment field.” Farinacci, col. 7, line 29-31. However, a “sequence number” and an “acknowledgment field” do not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Instead, Farinacci teaches that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an

acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet.” Farinacci, col. 7, lines 29-32. “[A] sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgment field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask” as claimed by Applicants.

As set forth above, Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 4. As such, the combination of Farinacci, in view of Tseung, also does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 4. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claims 5-6 depend directly from claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5-6 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 4.

Claim 7 has also been amended to recite, in pertinent part, “wherein said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Support for this limitation may be found in Applicants’ specification, page 14, lines 9-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Instead, Farinacci teaches “[n]ode C 301c has no feasible successor for its route to node N 301n, so it sends a query packet 403 as its response to node B 301b.” Farinacci, col. 5, lines 53-55.

The Office Action asserts that the above-identified sentence of Farinacci teaches “receiving a request to complete said task from at least one device.” See, Office Action, page 2. However, a “query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose a request including “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device” as claimed by Applicants.

Farinacci further states:

Query packets 403 may be multicast, in response to losing a feasible successor to a destination, or may be unicast, in response to a query packet 403 where the router 105 receiving a query packet 403 also does not have a feasible successor. In this case, however, the neighbor router 105 initiates its own multicast query packet 403 and must eventually respond to the originator of the first query packet 403 with a reply packet 404. Query packets 403 may also be unicast when a multicast query packet 403 is not acknowledged by one or more specific neighbor routers 105, as disclosed herein.

Farinacci, col. 7, lines 12-22.

“Query packets 403 [that] may be multicast . . . or . . . unicast” does not teach, suggest or disclose “query packets” that include “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” In addition, “the neighbor router 105 initiat[ing] its own multicast query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.”

Applicants wish to emphasize that the claimed request does not merely claim an identifier. Instead, the claimed request claims “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” For example, Farinacci discloses that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number . . . and an acknowledgment field.” Farinacci, col. 7, line 29-31. However, a “sequence number” and an “acknowledgment field” do not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Instead, Farinacci teaches that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet.” Farinacci, col. 7, lines 29-32. “[A] sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask” as claimed by Applicants.

As set forth above, Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 7. As such, the combination of Farinacci, in view of Tseung, also does not teach, suggest or disclose

all of the elements of claim 7. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 depends directly from claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 7.

Claim 9 has also been amended to recite, in pertinent part, “wherein said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Support for this limitation may be found in Applicants’ specification, page 14, lines 9-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Instead, Farinacci teaches “[n]ode C 301c has no feasible successor for its route to node N 301n, so it sends a query packet 403 as its response to node B 301b.” Farinacci, col. 5, lines 53-55.

The Office Action asserts that the above-identified sentence of Farinacci teaches “receiving a request to complete said task from at least one device.” See, Office Action, page 2. However, a “query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose a request including “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device” as claimed by Applicants.

Farinacci further states:

Query packets 403 may be multicast, in response to losing a feasible successor to a destination, or may be unicast, in response to a query packet 403 where the router 105 receiving a query packet 403 also does not have a feasible successor. In this case, however, the neighbor router 105 initiates its own multicast query packet 403 and must eventually respond to the originator of the first query packet 403 with a reply packet 404. Query packets 403 may also be unicast when a multicast query packet 403 is not acknowledged by one or more specific neighbor routers 105, as disclosed herein.

Farinacci, col. 7, lines 12-22.

“Query packets 403 [that] may be multicast . . . or . . . unicast” does not teach, suggest or disclose “query packets” that include “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” In addition, “the neighbor router 105 initiat[ing] its own multicast query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.”

Applicants wish to emphasize that the claimed request does not merely claim an identifier. Instead, the claimed request claims “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” For example, Farinacci discloses that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number . . . and an acknowledgment field.” Farinacci, col. 7, line 29-31. However, a “sequence number” and an “acknowledgment field” do not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Instead, Farinacci teaches that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet.” Farinacci, col. 7, lines 29-32. “[A] sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask” as claimed by Applicants.

As set forth above, Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 9. As such, the combination of Farinacci, in view of Tseung, also does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-11 depend directly from claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-11 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 9.

Claim 12 has also been amended to recite, in pertinent part, “wherein said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Support for this limitation may be found in Applicants’ specification, page 14, lines 9-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Instead, Farinacci teaches “[n]ode C 301c has no feasible successor for its route to node N 301n, so it sends a query packet 403 as its response to node B 301b.” Farinacci, col. 5, lines 53-55.

The Office Action asserts that the above-identified sentence of Farinacci teaches “receiving a request to complete said task from at least one device.” See, Office Action, page 2. However, a “query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose a request including “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device” as claimed by Applicants.

Farinacci further states:

Query packets 403 may be multicast, in response to losing a feasible successor to a destination, or may be unicast, in response to a query packet 403 where the router 105 receiving a query packet 403 also does not have a feasible successor. In this case, however, the neighbor router 105 initiates its own multicast query packet 403 and must eventually respond to the originator of the first query packet 403 with a reply packet 404. Query packets 403 may also be unicast when a multicast query packet 403 is not acknowledged by one or more specific neighbor routers 105, as disclosed herein.

Farinacci, col. 7, lines 12-22.

“Query packets 403 [that] may be multicast . . . or . . . unicast” does not teach, suggest or disclose “query packets” that include “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” In addition, “the neighbor router 105 initiat[ing] its own multicast query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.”

Applicants wish to emphasize that the claimed request does not merely claim an identifier. Instead, the claimed request claims “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” For example, Farinacci discloses that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number . . . and an acknowledgment field.” Farinacci, col. 7, line 29-31. However, a “sequence number” and an “acknowledgment field” do not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Instead, Farinacci teaches that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet.” Farinacci, col. 7, lines 29-32. “[A] sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask” as claimed by Applicants.

As set forth above, Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 12. As such, the combination of Farinacci, in view of Tseung, also does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 12. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claims 13-14 depend directly from claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13-14 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 12.

Claim 15 has also been amended to recite, in pertinent part, “wherein said request includes an Internet Protocol (IP) address, an IP subnet mask and an identifier for said at least one device.” Support for this limitation may be found in Applicants’ specification, page 14, lines 9-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest “said request includes Internet Protocol (IP) address, an IP subnet mask and an identifier for said at least one device.” Instead, Farinacci teaches “[n]ode C 301c has no feasible successor for its route to node

N 301n, so it sends a query packet 403 as its response to node B 301b.” Farinacci, col. 5, lines 53-55.

The Office Action asserts that the above-identified sentence of Farinacci teaches “receiving a request to complete said task from at least one device.” See, Office Action, page 2. However, a “query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose a request including “an Internet Protocol (IP) address, an IP subnet mask and an identifier for said at least one device” as claimed by Applicants.

Farinacci further states:

Query packets 403 may be multicast, in response to losing a feasible successor to a destination, or may be unicast, in response to a query packet 403 where the router 105 receiving a query packet 403 also does not have a feasible successor. In this case, however, the neighbor router 105 initiates its own multicast query packet 403 and must eventually respond to the originator of the first query packet 403 with a reply packet 404. Query packets 403 may also be unicast when a multicast query packet 403 is not acknowledged by one or more specific neighbor routers 105, as disclosed herein.

Farinacci, col. 7, lines 12-22.

“Query packets 403 [that] may be multicast . . . or . . . unicast” does not teach, suggest or disclose “query packets” that include “an Internet Protocol (IP) address, an IP subnet mask and an identifier for said at least one device.” In addition, “the neighbor router 105 initiat[ing] its own multicast query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “said request includes an Internet Protocol (IP) address, an IP subnet mask and an identifier for said at least one device.”

Applicants wish to emphasize that the claimed request does not merely claim an identifier. Instead, the claimed request claims “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” For example, Farinacci discloses that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number . . . and an acknowledgment field.” Farinacci, col. 7, line 29-31. However, a “sequence number” and an “acknowledgment field” do not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Instead, Farinacci teaches that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an

acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet.” Farinacci, col. 7, lines 29-32. “[A] sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgment field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask” as claimed by Applicants.

As set forth above, Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 15. As such, the combination of Farinacci, in view of Tseung, also does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 15. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claim 16 depends directly from claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 15.

Claim 17 has also been amended to recite, in pertinent part, “wherein said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Support for this limitation may be found in Applicants’ specification, page 14, lines 9-11.

Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” Instead, Farinacci teaches “[n]ode C 301c has no feasible successor for its route to node N 301n, so it sends a query packet 403 as its response to node B 301b.” Farinacci, col. 5, lines 53-55.

The Office Action asserts that the above-identified sentence of Farinacci teaches “receiving a request to complete said task from at least one device.” See, Office Action, page 2. However, a “query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose a request including “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device” as claimed by Applicants.

Farinacci further states:

Query packets 403 may be multicast, in response to losing a feasible successor to a destination, or may be unicast, in response to a query packet 403 where the router 105 receiving a query packet 403 also does not have a feasible successor. In this case, however, the neighbor router 105 initiates its own multicast query packet 403 and must eventually respond to the originator of the first query packet 403 with a reply packet 404. Query packets 403 may also be unicast when a multicast query packet 403 is not acknowledged by one or more specific neighbor routers 105, as disclosed herein.

Farinacci, col. 7, lines 12-22.

“Query packets 403 [that] may be multicast . . . or . . . unicast” does not teach, suggest or disclose “query packets” that include “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.” In addition, “the neighbor router 105 initiat[ing] its own multicast query packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “said request includes an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask for said at least one device.”

Applicants wish to emphasize that the claimed request does not merely claim an identifier. Instead, the claimed request claims “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” For example, Farinacci discloses that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number . . . and an acknowledgment field.” Farinacci, col. 7, line 29-31. However, a “sequence number” and an “acknowledgment field” do not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask.” Instead, Farinacci teaches that “[e]ach packet may have a sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet.” Farinacci, col. 7, lines 29-32. “[A] sequence number 406, to indicate that an acknowledgment is required, and an acknowledgement field, to indicate that the packet acknowledges receipt of another packet” does not teach, suggest or disclose “an identifier, an Internet Protocol (IP) address and an IP subnet mask” as claimed by Applicants.

As set forth above, Farinacci does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements of claim 17. As such, the combination of Farinacci, in view of Tseung, also does not teach, suggest or

Appl. No. 09/892,296
Amtd. dated November 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2006

disclose all of the elements of claim 17. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 depends directly from claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 17.

II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



/Wesley L. Austin/

Wesley L. Austin
Reg. No. 42,273
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 27, 2006

MADSON & AUSTIN
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/537-1700